

RECEIVED

NOV 7 1996

1FQQMAIL ROOM

Federal Communications Comm

1919 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

DOCKET # MM # 93-48 Children's TV Act

Dear Sir or Madam,

I would like to request that more be done to clean up the violence and sex on television during the hours children would be watching.

Television has become purely discusting even for adults but especially for children. Is it any wonder society has such problems with TV's show and tell on the lowest side of life?

Sincerely,

Phobe Kalper

Phobe Galpin

#### RECEIVED

From:

<mcyukon@alaska.net>

To: Date: A4.A4(ssegal) 11/6/95 10:03pm

Subject:

Chairman's Column Comments

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

NOV 7' 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Jerry McDonnell (mcyukon@alaska.net) writes:

I'm in favor of more support for technology in the classroom, especially in the area of Internet and electronic mail. I would also like to have the business community regulated so we have more quality programs and less quanity. We don't need more channels. We need the channels we have to be used to promote literacy. Not literacy only in the basics but in the classics. Many of our citizens today are victims of "trash" entertainment and consider that "good" art. I realize we cannot dictate each individuals taste or "wants" but we seem to live in a society ruled by a big business mentality that believes we should give the general populace what they "want."

Do you give a child what they want? Is that the way we are to raise our children? We must consider that an uneducated populace is like a child. In proper parenting you give the child choices. But make sure those choices are well presented.

It comes back to that same word we hear so often as of late: responsibility. We have a responsibility to our society outside of, and more important than material gain. In ancient cultures lessons were taught by elders passing down moral tales to enforce behavior and regulate the survivial of society.

I am suggesting that our elders--big business--are not good elders. They have not learned to be good stewards of our society.

Somehow we have to get that back.

Forgive me for begining to ramble. I'm a writer and as such I think through my fingertips. I just ran across this spot on the net while looking for something else in your agency. I would like to think it through some more and respond with suggestions rather than mere comments.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0

Remote host: Remote IP address: 198.70.204.50

### RECEIVED

From:

Chris Ford <lola@primenet.com>

To: Date: A4.A4(FCCMAIL)

Subject:

11/7/95 2:40am HDTV sellout?

Dear FCC official(s):

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

[re: case # 87-268]

It seems that the media heavies want to utilize technological advances in digital broadcasting to line their pockets rather than improve the picture quality of what viewers see in their homes.

The spectrum of the airwaves once slated for high definition TV (HDTV) may instead by used by huge media corporations to increase the amount of programming that they already send viewers -- using the same 1960s-vintage picture quality.

The spectrum width once thought necessary for an HDTV channel can now carry four to six regular (picture) quality TV broadcasts or a couple of TV channels plus paging services and wireless data transmission, thanks to technological advancements in digital broadcasting.

Licensees can make more money selling ads on four (or six) regular quality stations than one HDTV outlet. Currently, TV stations are trying to get digital licenses FOR FREE with vitually no restrictions on what they will do with them. This spectrum giveaway will be MANDATED if the House of Representatives' telecommunications "reform" proposal becomes law.

How is the public interest served if the schlockmeisters who currently control the airwaves get control of four times as many channels? Wouldn't dozens of new stations better serve the public in independent hands, which would counteract the growing concentration of media ownership?

Auctioning off the public airwaves to the highest bidder is not a solution, either. That would only exacerbate the current problem, giving the more well-financed corporations, such as phone and cable companies, control of a majority of the airwaves.

The FCC's mandate is to see that the airwaves serve all the public, not just shareholders of the media giants. It is your duty to see that public interest standards determine who gets access to new broadcast channels.

Thank you.

Chris Ford

## RECEIVED

From:

Scott McLeod <smcleod@oec.com>

To:

A16.A16(kidstv) 11/7/95 11:10am

Date: Subject:

Children's Television Act of 1990

Dear FCC,

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

NOV 7 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I'm a big supporter of Freedom of Speech! I do NOT think that broadcasters should be required and/or restricted in what they broadcast. I believe that support for public television and public radio are appropriate avenues for more intelligent children's programming.

If people don't like the trash coming in from the networks, ... turn off the set and sit down with their children in person!

I'm copying my letter to the President as I hope he will veto this bill in the unhappy event that it reaches his desk.

Thank you for your attention.

Scott C McLeod

:"Still tilting at windmills"

smcleod@oec.com

Open Environment Corporation - Development Team : (617) 562-5903

CC:

FCCMAIL.SMTP("president@whitehouse.com")

#### RECEIVED

From:

To: Date:

Subject:

Chairman's Column Comments WOCKET FILE COPY ORIC: WHI

NOV 7 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Katholeen Kampfe (aysha@scfn.thpl.lib.fl.us) writes:

Dear Chairman, You have the opportunity to restore faith in democracy! Campaign finance reform is urgently needed - candidates should be prohibited from buying any electronic advertising, but be given compensatory time by the broadcasters as a requirement of their license. Broadcasters have been given a license to print money for far too long - they are not operating in the public interest. They are operating for their own and corporate greedy interests. What we really need is a women owned and operated national network promoting environmentally sound policies and practices (goods and services insuring a healthy future for our children). It's a disgrace that we have sold out the planet for peanuts. People want real alternatives. We're sick of corporate special interests buying congress.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0 Remote host: frog.thpl.lib.fl.us Remote IP address: 204.198.80.3

#### RECEIVED

From:

<sdavis@ionet.net>

To:

A4.A4(ssegal)

Date: Subject: 11/6/95 8:34pm

Chairman's Column Comment DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

NOV 7°

FEDERAL COMMENICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Steve Davis (sdavis@ionet.net) writes:

(1) I do not believe that any purpose can be served by forcing television stations to carry any specific programming, including children's programming.

If the demand exists for that programming, they will carry it. If no demand exists, then why carry the programming? Whose needs are being served?

Commercial entities such as Nickelodeon and others have seen an apparent demand for programming targeted at children, and they do an excellent job of meeting the demand and (hopefully) turning a profit at the same time.

Channels such as the Discovery Channel, C-SPAN and others provide excellent programming without being coerced by the federal government into doing so.

- (2) I believe that in this information age internet access and distance learning are positive things for out children. However, I believe that this is a matter of local school funding, NOT federal regulation. Here in Tulsa, Oklahoma, I am voting YES this November on a bond issue to provide more computers in the public schools, including computers in the libraries connected to the Internet.
- (3) As for requiring TV guides to provide information as to program violence, sexual content, etc. ... the motive here is a good one, and as the father of two girls (ages 9 and 11) I certainly don't want them exposed to some of the excesses available in the media. However, most programming descriptions published today are adequate for the average parent to determine whether or not the program will be appropriate for their children. I believe it is the responsibility of the parents, rather than the Federal Government, to oversee their childrens' television viewing.
- (4) For the fourth item, I would personally welcome and watch more political debates and other programming which could help myself and others to make more informed decisions on political matters. However, again, I believe that if enough people are like me, such programming will be provided. And if not, too few people will watch the programming to make much of a difference anyway. The end result simply becomes more mountains of regulations and red tape.

Thanks for the chance to submit my comments. I hope they will be given some consideration.

Steve Davis

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0 Remote host: tsip30.ionet.net Remote IP address: 206.28.164.39

From:

<jjgray@sosi.com>

To: Date: A4.A4(ssegal)

Subject:

Chairman's Column Comments FILE COPY ORIGINAL

John J. Gray, Jr. (jjgray@sosi.com) writes:

DOCKET FILE OUT OF ORIGINA

I agree wholeheartedly with the concepts you have put forth above. Thanks you for asking,

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0 Remote host: slip8129.rmii.com Remote IP address: 166.93.8.129 RECEIVED

NOV 7 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From:

<ehindman@badlands.nodak.edu>

To:

A4.A4(ssegal)

Date: Subject: 11/6/95 5:29pm

CKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL Chairman's Column Commit

RECEIVED

Elizabeth Blanks Hindman (ehindman@badlands.nodak.edu) writes:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Chairman Hundt:

I'm a professor of mass communication at North Dakota State University, and a member of the Board of Directors of the Office of Communication for the United Church of Christ. I encourage you and the other commissioners to support a minimum standard for children's television: at least 3 hours per week (preferably more). In addition, stations should have to provide their own time, and not be permitted to pay another broadcaster to "do their time" for them.

Finally, I hope you and the rest of the FCC will enact strict guidelines concerning what constitutes children's programming. "The Jetsons" and other shows just don't cut it.

I'll leave the other topics for another time.

Thanks for your attention.

Elizabeth Blanks Hindman Assistant professor Dept. of Communication North Dakota State University Fargo, ND 58105

ehindman@badlands.nodak.edu

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0

Remote host: min321c.comm.ndsu.NoDak.edu

Remote IP address: 134.129.87.150

# RECEIVED

FC . On

Nov. 3, 1995

Nancy K. Schneider 1153 Bishop Rd. Grosse Pointe Park MI 48230

FCC, office of the Secretary 1919 M St., NW Washington, DC 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Re: MM Docket 93-48

Dear Federal Communications Commission:

If we care about the future of our society, we will give our children more educational TV! As a parent, I support legislation that would replace the current garbage with worthwhile educational programs. Sponsors of programs need, perhaps, a financial incentive to sponsor educational programs.

Sincerely, Many K. Schneider Nancy K. Schneider

No. of Copies rec'd